Gender, Race, and Ethnic Relations

Sebastian E. Bartoș and Peter Hegarty

University of Surrey

Introduction

After the Second World War, 'prejudice' became an object of the new science of social psychology. Gordon Allport's (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice* was both the defining text of this field and its most enduringly influential synthesis. In spite of numerous theoretical and terminological alternatives, 'prejudice' has remained prominent. The long-standing treatment of women as sub-ordinates to men, usually termed *sexism* or *misogyny*, has been sometimes subsumed within the overall category of prejudice. As an increasing range of groups make collective claims for equal treatment, *homophobia*, *fat prejudice*, *ableism*, *mental illness stigma*, and *ageism* have all become objects of study for social and political psychology (Nelson, 2009). In this chapter, we will be using the terms *discrimination* to designate the unfair treatment of certain groups (e.g., employers' reluctance to hire ethnic minority individuals), and *stereotypes* to describe persistent overgeneralisations about groups (e.g., the belief that women are inherently nurturing). Overall, terminological nuances and disputes are beyond the scope of this chapter (see Dovidio et al., 2010, for a discussion). We aim to review and evaluate the attempts of social and political psychology to make sense of conflicts based on group identity.

French Encyclopaedists of the 18th century introduced 'prejudice' as a general term for 'false judgements' (Jaucourt, 1765, p. 283), i.e., ideas contrary to the Enlightenment. This definition, as well as the Encyclopaedists' comparison of prejudice with an epidemic disease survived well into the 20th century (Kitzinger, 1987; Danziger, 1997). Then as now, scholars have seen prejudice as irrational, self-centred, and morally objectionable (Billig, 1991). However,

the 20th century witnessed violence and genocide on a greater scale and with more systematic organisation. In the post-war period, the Holocaust was recognised as a definitive infringement of the ideals of the European Enlightenment. Innumerable scholars searched for, and authored explanations of the Holocaust, drawing on knowledge of individuals, societies, cultures, and ideologies.

Prejudice has been approached by researchers from three broad angles (see Adam, 1998, for a three-levelled analysis of sexual prejudice). First, scholars across a range of disciplines have examined how prejudice shapes institutions, policies, and society at large. Second, psychologists have looked at the thoughts and feelings of people who practice prejudice and of those who suffer from it. Third, we can analyse science, the arts, the media and other cultural produces in order to understand how both prejudice and tolerance are ingrained in our taken-for-granted ways of representing other people. In the following three sections, we illustrate each of these levels of analysis by summarising historically influential lines of research. We conclude with a case study of ethnic and sexual prejudice in Romania, examining how these three levels may be brought together to provide a better understanding of concrete examples of prejudice.

Social and Political Accounts

Genocide

Ethnic relations are at their worst when people kill each other on a large scale, in organised and systematic ways, in the name of group identity, often enacting sexual violence on women, men and children in the process. Since the Holocaust, social psychologists have attempted to understand how *genocide* occurs, and have been particularly vexed to make sense of how people can engage in such large-scale collective actions.

Contemporary explanations of genocides are highly complex. Staub (1989) posited that economic, political, and cultural factors all contribute to the gradual deterioration of interethnic relations that eventually degenerates into genocide. Based on a very broad review of the literature, Monroe, Hankin, and Van Vechten (2000) developed a similar multi-step model. A background of ethnic conflict is an important prerequisite, but does not necessarily lead to violence. Genocide is generally preceded by a disruption of the social order through war or revolution, and a psychological shift from excluding 'others' to construing them as less than human (i.e., dehumanisation). While such ideologies may seem extreme, social psychologists have found that people often implicitly dehumanise outgroups by attributing them fewer distinctly human emotions than to ingroups (Leyens et al., 2001). The brain regions involved in thinking about other human beings are also less active when thinking about certain outgroups (Harris and Fiske, 2006). The prerequisites of genocide may therefore be more widespread than we commonly think.

Laws and Institutions

Laws and policies often prompt exclusion and violence. Allport (1954) noted that laws that promote inequality will usually have dire consequences. So-called 'Jim Crow laws' in the United States, for example, promoted segregation and implicitly legitimised lynchings of Black people (Jones, 1997). Today, bans on marrying someone of the same gender lead to increases in mood and anxiety disorders among gay, lesbian and bisexual populations (Hatzenbuehler et al., 2010).

In many societies, however, laws aim to prevent both genocide and more subtle forms of prejudice, such as employment discrimination (Barron and Hebl, 2012). However, interventions to promote equity must communicate their goals and strategies effectively; otherwise, both the

majority and the (protected) minority become suspicious and perceive the policy as unfair (Crosby, Iyer, and Sincharoen, 2006).

Work and Employment

Opportunities for adults to work and earn money, as well as the fair treatment of people in the workplace, are central to well-being and social equality. Wage work has long been scripted as a male activity, creating the stereotype that women are not predisposed to work, or at least are unfit for certain jobs (Eagly and Steffen, 1986). In spite of the laws and policies of many governments and organisations, inequalities remain a reality to this day. In the EU, for example, women still earn less than men by an average 16.4 % (European Commission, 2012b) and ethnic minorities also earn less than majorities do (Metcalf, 2009). Such inequalities do not simply diminish over time; the recent budget cuts in the United Kingdom have actually worsened gender inequality in the workplace (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2012).

Several social scientists have described career-related inequalities using glass as a metaphor, since it conveys both the hardness and the invisibility of these phenomena. The *glass ceiling* denotes barriers to advancement to top-level positions for both women and ethnic minority men (Morrison and Von Glinow, 1990). Stereotypes of effective leaders as agentic tend to favour men for leadership positions, since women are not perceived as typically strong and active (Schein, 1973). However, a lack-of-fit is not always a disadvantage; men who work in professions such as nursing or education -- in which most employees are women -- experience career advantages that Williams (1992) has named the *glass escalator*. Most recently, Haslam and Ryan (2008) have also described a *glass cliff*: women are often promoted to positions of leadership that are likely to involve failure and blame, e.g., when the organisation is in a crisis.

Psychological Explanations

The Person and the Situation

Shortly after the Second World War, Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) tried to understand the racism underlying the Holocaust. They used questionnaires to survey a large number of people in the US, and concluded that racism was part of a complex *authoritarian personality*. In line with then-dominant psychoanalytic theories, Adorno et al. attributed this disposition to early experiences: repressive parenting prompts children to strictly control both others' and their own behaviour. Fascism, superstition, conventionalism, and prejudice are but facets of this need for control (Fromm, 1965). More recent research has further refined Adorno et al.'s work (e.g., Altemeyer, 1981) and integrated it with other theories of prejudice and personality (Sibley and Duckitt, 2008).

Situationist theories brought about a very important theoretical turn arguing that all of us can espouse prejudice in certain contexts. *Dispositionist accounts*, such as the authoritarian personality, cannot explain wars and genocide on their own (Houghton, 2009); although psychological authoritarianism is widespread, extreme violence is fortunately rare. In a classical study, Hovland and Sears (1940) showed that Black people were more frequently lynched in the Southern US during economic downturns, thus demonstrating how social (and not just individual) factors played a role in prejudice. Laboratory studies later found that experimenters could easily induce distrust (Tajfel, 1970) and even violence (Milgram, 1963; Haney, Banks and Zimbardo, 1973) in people with no particular disposition. Moreover, as dispositionist theories see prejudice as ingrained in one's personality, they leave little basis to guide efforts for change. Indeed, the proponents of such theories often recommend situationist strategies for prejudice reduction (see,

e.g., Altemeyer's, 2006, advice on educational and legal reform).

A classic situationist explanation of prejudice emerged when Muzafer Sherif and his colleagues (1954) divided a group of boys on a summer camp into two teams. When the teams had to compete for rewards, they showed intense loathing of each other; however, when they needed to cooperate for common goals, their feelings changed accordingly. Based on this study, Sherif proposed a Realistic Conflict Theory of prejudice: groups detest each other because they compete for scarce resources -- or at least construe the situation as such. Henri Tajfel (1970) later showed that competition was not necessary for group tensions. He randomly assigned strangers to two groups, and asked them to allocate points to members of their own and the other group. Although there was no interaction or common task, people clearly favoured members of their own group. Such results led Tajfel to formulate a Social Identity Theory of prejudice: people become prejudiced when they identify with an 'ingroup' and assign others to an 'outgroup' (Tajfel and Turner, 1986). Later research in this tradition showed how changing the way people categorise others and themselves can effectively reduce prejudice (Crisp and Hewstone, 2007).

More recently, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) attempted to integrate situationist and dispositionist accounts. They described the relevant personality dimension as Social Dominance Orientation, an individual preference for a hierarchical, inequitable society. The theory also incorporate situationist elements like cross-cultural differences and social change. Such integrative approaches (see also Stephan and Stephan's, 2000, Integrated Threat Theory) have been met with mixed reactions. For some, they are a much awaited synthesis of previously fragmented prejudice research (Dion, 2003. and they contribute towards pluralism in this field (Dovidio et al., 2010). For others, integrative theories seem 'vague and confusing, [...] a mishmash [...] difficult to falsify' (Houghton, 2009, p. 175).

Reducing Prejudice

We noted above that dispositional theories of prejudice leave little ground for action. In contrast, Allport (1954) proposed early on that positive interactions between groups could reduce prejudice. Allport qualified his 'contact hypothesis' with a list of conditions: contact has a positive effect if the two groups have equal status, people can cooperate and make friends, and authorities promote tolerance. In a large meta-analytic review, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) found that contact was indeed moderately effective in reducing prejudice. As predicted, Allport's conditions facilitate prejudice reduction, but contact remains effective even when these criteria are not met (Pettigrew et al., 2011). Gaertner and his colleagues (1990) found that the effect of contact was mediated by social categorisation processes: meeting people from an outgroup changes the way we categorise them, leading to a more inclusive worldview (see also Chapter 3 in this volume). Contact also reduces intergroup anxiety, by familiarising people with outgroup members, and making future encounters less awkward (Stephan and Stephan, 1985; Pettigrew et al., 2011). Negative encounters, on the other hand, may increase prejudice (Paolini, Harwood and Rubin, 2010).

Beyond contact, a range of other approaches have proved effective in reducing prejudice (Paluck and Green, 2009). Numerous educational programmes seem effective, but research has not satisfactorily explained how or why they work (Paluck and Green, 2009). More recent experiments have often attempted to make tolerance and empathy more salient to their participants (e.g., Monteith, Deneen and Tooman, 1996). The effect of the mass-media on prejudice is a particularly relevant question today: seeing cross-group friendships in the media can promote tolerance (Pettigrew et al., 2011) but the mechanisms behind this effect remain unclear (Paluck and Green, 2009). Overall, a great deal of research is needed to understand

whether and *how* strategies other than contact can reduce prejudice (Dovidio et al., 2010; Bartoş, Berger and Hegarty, under review).

Responding to Prejudice

In the wake of Black, women's, and gay liberation movements 'the target's perspective' on prejudice has received less attention (Swim and Stangor, 1998). During that period, many social scientists moved their attention away from the target groups, who were previously studied as 'deviants,' and towards the majority groups that were now made responsible for inequality[1] (Duckitt, 2010). Prejudice, however, has a number of well-documented effects on those targeted. The expectation that women and Black people have inferior performances on some intellectual tasks often becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy: those being tested are made aware of the stereotypes about their groups, and this awareness leads them to underperform (Steele and Aronson, 1995; Spencer, Steele, and Quinn, 1999).

The impact of prejudice on health probably has the most complex policy implications. Marginalised groups tend to fare worse than the majority on health indicators. Large-scale surveys and systematic reviews have found that Black Americans (Williams, Neighbors, and Jackson, 2003), women (WHO, 2009), and lesbians, gay men, and bisexual people (Cochran, 2001) have poorer health outcomes. On the one hand, people in marginalised groups may have less access to adequate healthcare (WHO, 2001). On the other hand, discrimination increases stress, which both impairs health and prompts hazardous behaviours such as substance use (Meyer, 1995; Pascoe and Richman, 2008; Hatzenbuehler, Nolen-Hoeksma, and Dovidio, 2009).

Those who suffer because of prejudice, however, are not always passive; they can organise themselves, pool their resources, and systematically defend their interests. Movements for

gender, racial, and sexual equality have all achieved media visibility and at least some policy change (Amenta et al., 2010). Nevertheless, the actual merit of social movements is far from clear: the success of political action is difficult to define and measure, and the outcome depends both on the movement itself and on a favourable social and political context (Giugni, 1998; Amenta et al., 2010).

Cultural and Philosophical Reflection

Measuring Prejudice

Most psychological theories we discussed in the previous section depend on the assumption that self-report measures can validly assess a person's prejudice. Large-scale research projects often rely heavily on the easy application of questionnaires. The World Values Survey, for example, regularly assesses the attitudes of thousands of people over the world (Inglehart and Baker, 2000) and has lead to claims about reduction of societal sexism and heterosexism in Western Europe over the last two decades (Inglehart, 2008).

However, when assessing prejudice with self-report measures, there is always a risk that people may be insincere in order to appear tolerant. In response, researchers have created so-called 'modern' measures: rather than explicitly asking people whether they loath a certain group, such measures ask whether the group has too many rights or has gone too far in demanding equality in regard to race (McConaghy, 1983), gender (Swim, 1994) or sexuality (Morrison and Morrison, 2002). More subtle measures are available as well. The implicit association test (IAT) is a simple computer-based task in which participants' response times are measured. It is assumed that people who are prejudiced towards a specific group give quicker responses when they have to associate that group with negative stereotypes than positive

attributes (Greenwald, McGhee and Schwarz, 1998). Prejudice may also be assessed through behavioural tasks, e.g., by asking participants to help a person who belongs to a marginalised group. However, these measures are subject to contextual variation (Saucier, Miller and Doucet, 2005) and it may be difficult to demonstrate their validity. They are also more time-consuming, more costly, and less portable than pencil-and-paper methods.

Prejudice is of course not always conceptualised on an individual level. Sociologists and political scientists use the income gap between men and women and between White and non-White people as a measure of societal prejudice (see the section on *Social and Political Accounts* above). Achebe's (1977) analysis of racism in English literature and Friedan's (1963) book on sexist stereotypes in women's magazines showed how cultural prejudice often goes unnoticed and is accepted as natural. In recent decades, more social psychologists in Europe have focused on talk and texts, rather than on the individual psyche, in order to grasp prejudice. We discuss their work next.

Prejudice and Discourse

Discourse analysts emphasise how researchers and laypeople actively construe such notions as 'prejudice' through their talk. In a seminal study, Margaret Wetherell and her colleagues (1986, discussed in Wetherell and Potter, 1992) interviewed white New Zealanders on their views of the Maori. In these interviews, people often made prejudiced statements preceded by a disclaimer ('I am not racist, but...'); the same person would offer a mix of both very positive and very negative opinions. People seemingly selected their arguments in order to appear balanced and unprejudiced. Such disclaimers and contradictory statements were also identified in talking about non-White immigrants in Western Europe (van Dijk, 1992), gay people in the UK

(Gough, 2002) and others.

Discourse analytic research emphasises that talk is highly variable and that the construction of events, people, and objects depends on context. Thus, the New Zealanders in Wetherell's study probably did not construct themselves as non-racist in every social encounter: talk occurs in a specific situation (e.g., a research interview) and fulfils specific goals (e.g., to make a good impression). Discourse analysis aims to provide a critique not just of prejudice, but also of its constructed opposite, i.e., 'tolerant' talk. People in our society try to present themselves as rational, unprejudiced beings; they use disclaimers (Wetherell et al., 1986) and offer makeshift arguments when they berate a group (Kleiner, 1998). People also tend to present prejudice as a characteristic of small, 'extremist' groups, and they often emphasise that most people (including themselves) are above irrational loathing of others (Billig, 1991; Sedgwick, 1994, 141-150). One powerful form of discourse is to construct marginalised groups' claims as excessive in relation to 'normal' rights (Peel, 2001). Moreover, arguments against prejudice may subtly confirm it. Those who claim, for example, that women are as good as men in leadership positions tacitly agree that men are the benchmark of competence (Bruckmüller, Hegarty, and Abele, 2012). Similarly, claims that families with gay parents resemble families with straight parents imply that the latter are the 'norm' (Clark, 2002).

Biopolitics and 'the Other'

Discourse analytic research prompted Potter and Wetherell (1987) to reject both dispositionist and situationist accounts of prejudice in favour of a theory of discourse as actively achieving social inclusion and exclusion. Thus the construction of oneself as 'not a racist' exemplifies how 'categories [of people] are selected and formulated in such a way that their

specific features help accomplish certain goals' (p. 137). Wetherell (1998) went on to argue that discourse was explained by looking at both the dynamics of conversation and the 'interpretive repertoires' that people draw upon to accomplish goals in their talk. Discourse then serves social, economic, and political interests. This discursive approach puts the social psychology of prejudice in more explicit dialogue with critical theory and poststructuralist thought.

Marxist thinkers of the 20th century have typically assumed that long-standing forms of labelling and exclusion have economic explanations (Parker, 2004). French philosopher Simone de Beauvoir (1949) remarks that women had become *the Other* in philosophical thought, whose existence was described by positioning women in contrast with or secondary to men. Misogyny fulfils the interests of men, just as racism and anti-Semitism serve White people. Beauvoir's partner Jean-Paul Sartre (1960) later analysed dehumanising race relations in French Algeria in related terms, concluding that racism is the psychological internalisation of (economic) colonialism. Specifically, exploitation leads to a 'hate and fear' that turn the colonised into the 'Other-than-human' (p. 676).

Michel Foucault later contested Sartre's and others' assumptions that Othering had primarily economic explanations, in favour of a theory that discourse had a self-organising character. Modern states, Foucault argued, aim to regulate their citizens' health, sexuality, and mortality, resulting in increasingly common forms of *biopolitics* that focus on bodily difference and productivity (Foucault, 2009). Since biopolitics occurs within modern, rational societies, it relies on claims with a scientific aura for its legitimacy. While racism was useful for justifying economic exploitation in the colonies, biopolitics was the enterprise that really needed racist, sexist, and homophobic justifications: by arguing that non-White races were inferior, that homosexuals were mentally ill, that women were hysterical, 19th and 20th century governments

could legitimise measures like forced sterilisation, segregation, starvation, and eventually mass murder (Stoler, 1995). Foucault himself wrote a three-volume study to the *History of Sexuality* (1976-1984. in which he examines how law and medicine have created such categories as the 'homosexual' in order to regulate private life.

Case study: Sexual and Racial Prejudice in Romania

In this section, we illustrate how different theoretical approaches can be brought to bear on ethnic and gender-related prejudices in a European nation, Romania. If several types of prejudice are widespread in Romania, Romanians themselves face exclusion in a European context. Unlike most EU citizens, Romanian nationals still need (as of 2013) special permission to work in the UK and a number of other EU countries. The mass-media in Western Europe often represents them as felons, beggars, and prostitutes (Mogoș, 2007).

Racial Prejudice

The Gypsies (also called Roma) were historically enslaved in parts of present-day Romania, and nomadic communities were often forced to settle. During the Second World War, a large number of Gypsies were deported; the subsequent communist regime, despite its egalitarian ideology, was largely unsympathetic to this group. Only in the 1990s was the Romani language allowed in schools, and were Roma political and cultural organisations permitted (Achim, 2004.) After racial and ethnic discrimination were banned by the 1991 Constitution of Romania, several groups and organisations became active on behalf of the Gypsies, including an emerging Roma feminist movement (Oprea, 2005).

Despite these developments, Gypsy people and Roma ethnic identity are widely rejected in Romania. Surveys show that many people in Romania associate Gypsies with violence (64%) and felonies (74%); agree with segregation in schools (31.2 %) and commercial venues (20.4%); and would not accept a Gypsy person as a spouse of kin (53.3%; INSOMAR, 2009). As in other parts of Europe, anti-Gypsy prejudice in Romania is closely tied to dehumanization and claims of cultural inferiority (Rodríguez-Pérez et al., 2011): Gypsy traditions are construed as 'primitive' in opposition to the allegedly progressive culture of the majority (Oprea, 2005). Tileagă (2005) found that his (non-Gypsy) interviewees, whether they were more or less tolerant, saw Gypsies as being outside the Romanian nation, both culturally and biologically; participants even suggested that Gypsies may not be fully human. Consistent with these discourses, Marcu's (2007) experiments showed that fewer human characteristics were attributed to Gypsies than other ethnic groups, and that dehumanisation was related to Gypsies' poverty and distinctive culture. As in the case of other groups, real and imagined contact may break down anti-Gypsy prejudice in Romania. Cernat (2011) found that reading about interethnic friendships reduced Romanian people's intergroup anxiety and anti-Gypsy prejudice.

Sexual Prejudice

Less is known about the history of Romanian gay people than about Romanian Gypsies. 'Sexual inversion' was criminalised in Romania only in 1936. Sodomy laws were abolished and replaced by an anti-discrimination bill in 2002 (Spineanu-Dobrotă, 2005). The relation of Romanians to Western Europe is material to this history: it has often been noted that Romania only embraced anti-homophobia policies as a means of becoming a member of the EU (see Creţeanu and Coman, 1998, on the Romanian media). Gay pride parades have been taking place

in Bucharest since 2005, sometimes amidst violent opposition (Woodcock, 2009); and the Gay Movie Nights are organised annually in Cluj-Napoca.

Surveys have shown gay people to be one of Romania's most marginalised minorities (IPP, 2003; INSOMAR, 2009). More than two thirds of the respondents to the World Values Survey in Romania stated that homosexuality is never morally justifiable, as opposed to one quarter in the UK (Inglehart, 2008). An overwhelming majority of Romanians would not accept a lesbian or a gay men as a spouse of kin (90.5 %; INSOMAR, 2009), and 40% would not even allow gay and lesbian people to live in Romania (IPP, 2003). Unsurprisingly, many non-heterosexuals in Romania experience such forms of abuse as insults, battery, or false complaints to the police (ACCEPT, 2005).

Psychological research has been mostly silent on Romanian sexualities: a search for *Romanian AND (gay OR homosexual)* in PsycINFO returns only 9 results as of May 2013. A recent study on gay men found that experiences of prejudice are associated with less emotional wellbeing; this link is partially explained by discriminated gay men feeling less supported and cared for by others (Bartoș, 2010). Unsurprisingly, contact with non-heterosexual people is associated with less prejudice (Moraru, 2010).

A discourse analysis has been recently performed on the news reports of a gay pride event (Bartoș, Balș and Berger, 2013). Those who protested against the pride event argued that a Christian Romania must reject 'diversity' as a Western, foreign value. Gay rights organisations and the media also construed gay people as a minority that has distinct political goals and receives support from the West. While several different voices are represented in these reports, all of them converge to construe gay people as a political group outside the Romanian nation.

Discussion

Our case study of prejudice in Romania illustrates the interplay of different levels of analysis. First, a look the social and political level reveals a history of discriminatory laws and policies that have significantly improved over the last few decades. In the context of more political freedom after the fall of Communism, marginalised groups such as Gypsies and gay people also started organisations to promote social change; the success of these endeavours is yet to be determined, as much change was arguably achieved through external pressure from the EU. Second, research with self-report methods provides an insight into the psyche of both the bigot and the target of prejudice. As in many other contexts, contact with marginalised groups seems helpful to reduce prejudice (Moraru, 2010; Cernat, 2011); unfortunately, however, contact with gay people and Gypsies is avoided by most Romanians (INSOMAR, 2009). Third, discourse analyses of both everyday talk and the media reveal that differences between groups are overplayed: both Gypsies and gay people are systematically excluded from constructions of the Romanian nation (Tileagă, 2005; Bartoş et al., 2013).

Finally, different types of prejudice intersect. Both surveys (IPP, 2003) and discourse analyses (Bartoș et al., 2013) have pointed out the connections between ethnic and sexual prejudice. However, approaches disagree on why different forms of prejudice co-occur. In the case of Romania, the IPP (2003) study resorts to individual personality traits such as authoritarianism (but does not fail to discuss its social underpinnings); while discourse analysis assumes that history and power relations create discourses that exclude Others (Bartoş, et al., 2013).

Conclusions

In this chapter, we discussed three approaches to prejudice, and we summarised several lines of research that differ in terms of discipline, method, and epistemology. However, we find that these approaches often converge. In Romania, the dehumanisation of Gypsies was flagged up in both experimental (Marcu, 2007) and discourse-analytic research (Tileagă, 2005). Survey studies on 'modern heterosexism' (Morrison and Morrison, 2002) and discourse analyses of disclaiming prejudice ('I'm not homophobic but'; Gough, 2002) obviously investigate the same phenomenon. While we argue for pluralism in research, we do not propose any model or scheme to integrate all approaches. Different lines of research often rely on contradictory views of science and society; we agree with Stainton-Rogers (2003, chapter 1) that students of prejudice must decide on their own what they find credible and useful in context.

In closing, we warn our readers against reifying the notion of prejudice. It is usually assumed that prejudice is a coherent concept, with racism, sexism and homophobia as its (fairly similar) subtypes. Research is often performed mostly on one form of prejudice, and the conclusions are assumed to be easily extrapolated to the others. Phenomena like the glass cliff, for example, have been studies primarily in relation to gender (Haslam and Ryan, 2008. while racism has often been treated as a paradigm for all forms of prejudice (Billig, 1991). In everyday life, however, different groups face different challenges: Black people, for example, are often born into a community that can support them, while women and gay people are commonly victimised by their own families (Beauvoir, 1949). Enlightenment in this field has often followed from breaking with convention and received views. Therefore, we urge scholars interested in prejudice to learn from other lines of research, to avoid hasty generalisations, and to remain 'unprejudiced' about the nature of prejudice.

Author Biographies

Sebastian E. Bartoş is currently pursuing doctoral research at the University of Surrey. He holds an MA in Clinical Psychology from the Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca, Romania. His PhD thesis, supervised by Peter Hegarty, focuses on strategies to reduce homophobia. Sebastian's primary interest is in Eastern European sexualities, and he has published papers on media portrayals of gay people, online personal advertisements, and gay men's bereavement. He is also interested in methodological pluralism, and his own research employs such diverse methods as meta-analysis and discourse analysis.

Peter Hegarty is Reader and Head of the School of Psychology at the University of Surrey. His interests intersect social psychology, history of science, and gender and sexuality studies. His first book *Gentleman's Disagreement: Alfred Kinsey, Lewis Terman and the Sexual Politics of Smart Men* (University of Chicago Press, 2013) re-examines the relationships between the IQ testing movement and the sex survey from the vantage point of the relationship between leaders in these movements. Peter's recent work has been published in such venues as *British Journal of Psychology*, *History of the Human Sciences*, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, and *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. Interviews with Peter have been published on the Scientific American's 'Doing Good Science' blog and on the website of the project 'Psychology's Feminist Voices' (www.feministvoices.com).

References

ACCEPT (2005). *Bariere sociale în viaţa persoanelor LGBT*. [Social Barriers in the Lives of

LGBT Persons]. Bucharest: The Author.

Achebe, Chinua. (1977). An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's 'Heart of Darkness.' *Massachusetts Review,* 18. 782-794.

Achim, Viorel. (2004). *The Roma in Romanian History.* Budapest: CEU Press.

Adam, Barry D. (1998). Theorizing Homophobia. *Sexualities* 1:4. 387-404.

Adorno,Theodor.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, Daniel J. and Sanford, R.N. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality.* Oxford: Harpers.

Allport, Gordon W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice.* Oxford: Addison-Wesley.

Altemeyer, Robert. (2006). *The Authoritarians.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Altemeyer, Robert. (1981). *Right-Wing Authoritarianism.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Amenta,Edwin, Caren, Neal, Chiarello, Elizabeth, and Su,Yang. (2010). The Political Consequences of Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 36. 287-307.

Bailey, J. Michael and Zucker, Kenneth J. (1995). Childhood Sex-Typed Behavior and Sexual Orientation: A Conceptual Analysis and Quantitative Review. *Developmental Psychology* 31:1. 43-55.

Barron, Laura G. and Hebl, Michelle. (2012). THE FORCE OF LAW: The Effects of Sexual Orientation Antidiscrimination Legislation on Interpersonal Discrimination in Employment. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 19:2. 191-205.

Bartoș, Sebastian E. (2010). *Discrimination and Distress in Romanian Gay Men.* MA dissertation. Cluj-Napoca: Babeș-Bolyai University.

Bartoș, Sebastian E., Balș, Marius A. and Berger, Israel (2013). Since Trajan and Decebalus: Online Media Reporting of the 2010 GayFest in Bucharest. *Psychology and Sexuality*. doi: 10.1080/19419899.2013.784211

Bartoș, Sebastian E., Berger, Israel and Hegarty, Peter. (under review). Interventions to Reduce Sexual Prejudice: A Study-Space Analysis and Meta-Analytic Review.

Beauvoir, Simone de. (1949). *Le Deuxième sexe.* [The Second Sex] Paris: Gallimard.

Billig, Michael. (1991). *Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Psychology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Bruckmüller, Susanne, Hegarty, Peter and Abele, Andrea E. (2012). Framing Gender Differences: Linguistic Normativity Affects Perceptions of Power and Gender Stereotypes. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 42:2, 210-218.

Cernat, Vasile. (2011). Extended Contact Effects: Is Exposure to Positive Outgroup Exemplars Sufficient or Is Interaction with Ingroup Members Necessary? *Journal of Social Psychology* 151:6. 737-753.

Clarke, Victoria. (2002). Resistance and Normalization in the Construction of Lesbian and Gay Families: A Discursive Analysis. In Coyle, Adrian and Kitzinger, Celia (Eds.), *Lesbian and Gay Psychology: New Perspectives* (pp. 98-116). Oxford: BPS Blackwell.

Cochran, Susan D. (2001). Emerging Issues in Research on Lesbians' And Gay Men's Mental Health: Does Sexual Orientation Really Matter? *American Psychologist* 56:11. pp. 931-947.

Crețeanu, Antonia and Coman, Adrian. (1998). *Homosexualitatea în presa scrisă din România.* [Homosexuality in the Written Press of Romania]. Retrieved from http://accept.ong.ro/presarom.html

Crisp, Richard J. and Hewstone, Miles (2007). Multiple Social Categorization. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 39. 163-254.

Crosby, Faye J., Iyer, Aarti and Sincharoen, Sirinda. (2006). Understanding Affirmative Action. *Annual Review of Psychology* 57. 585-611

Danziger, Kurt. (1997). *Naming the Mind: How Psychology Found Its Language.* Thousand

Oaks: SAGE.

Dion, Kenneth L. (2003). Prejudice, Racism, and Discrimination. In T. Millon and M.J. Lerner (Eds.), *Social Psychology* (pp. 507-536). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Dovidio, John, Hewstone, Miles, Glick, Peter and Esses, Victoria. (2010). Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination: Theoretical and Empirical Overview. In Dovidio, John, Hewstone, Miles, Glick, Peter and Esses, Victoria (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination* (pp. 3-28). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Duckitt, John. (2010). Historical Overview. In Dovidio, John, Hewstone, Miles, Glick, Peter and Esses, Victoria (Eds.), *The SAGE Haandbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination* (pp. 29-44). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Dutton, Donald G. and Lennox, Vicki L. (1974). Effect of Prior Token' Compliance on Subsequent Interracial Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 29:1. 65-71.

Eagly, Alice H. and Steffen, Valerie J. (1986). Gender Stereotypes, Occupational Roles, and Beliefs about Part-Time Employees. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 10:3. 252-262.

Equality and Human Rights Commission. (2012). *Making Fair Financial Decisions: An Assessment of HM Treasury's 2010 Spending Review Conducted under Section 31 of the 2006 Equality Act.* Available at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/Inquiries/s31_final.pdf

European Commission (2012). *Progress on Equality between Women and Men in 2011*. Brussels: The Author.

Fiske,Susan T., Cuddy, Amy J.C., Glick, Peter, and Xu, Jun. (2002). A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow from Perceived Status and Competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82:6. 878-902.

Foucault, Michel. (2009). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France,*

1977-78. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Foucault, Michel. (1976). *L'Histoire de la sexualité*. [The History of Sexuality] Paris: Gallimard.

Friedan, Betty. (1963). *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Fromm, Erich. (1965). *Escape from Freedom*. New York: Avon Books.

Gaertner, Samuel L., Mann, Jeffrey A., Dovidio, John F., Murrell, Audrey J., and Pomare, Marina. (1990). How Does Cooperation Reduce Intergroup Bias? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59:4. 692-704.

Giugni, Marco G. (1998). Was It Worth The Effort? The Outcomes and Consequences of Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24. 371-393.

Goffman, Erving. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Gough, Brendan. (2002). 'I've Always Tolerated It But...': Heterosexual Masculinity and the Discursive Reproduction of Homophobia. In Coyle, Adrian and Kitzinger, Celia (Eds.), *Lesbian and Gay Psychology: New Perspectives* (pp. 219-238). Oxford: BPS Blackwell.

Greenwald, Anthony G., McGhee, Debbie E., and Schwartz, Jordan L.K. (1998). Measuring Individual Differences in Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74:6. 1464-1480.

Haney, Craig, Banks, Curtis and Zimbardo, Philip. (1973). Interpersonal Dynamics in a Simulated Prison. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology* 1:1. 69-97.

Harris, Lasana T. and Fiske, Susan T. (2006). Dehumanizing the Lowest of the Low: Neuroimaging Responses to Extreme Outgroups. *Psychological Science* 17:10. 847-853.

Haslam, S. Alex and Ryan, Michelle K. (2008). The Road to the Glass Cliff: Differences in the Perceived Suitability of Men and Women for Leadership Positions in Succeeding and Failing Organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly* 19:5. 530-546.

Hatzenbuehler, Mark L., McLaughlin, Katie A., Keyes, Katherine M., and Hasin, Deborah S. (2010). The Impact of Institutional Discrimination on Psychiatric Disorders in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations: A Prospective Study. *American Journal of Public Health* 1003. 452-459.

Hatzenbuehler, Mark L., Nolen-Hoeksema, Susan and Dovidio, John. (2009). How Does Stigma Get Under the Skin? The Mediating Role of Emotion Regulation. *Psychological Science* 20:10. 1282-1289.

Hegarty, Peter and Massey, Sean. (2007). Anti-Homosexual Prejudice... as Opposed to What? Queer Theory and the Social Psychology of Anti-Homosexual Attitudes. *Journal of Homosexuality* 52:1-2. 47-71.

Houghton, David P. (2009). *Political Psychology: Situations, Individuals, and Cases.* New York: Routledge.

Hovland, Carl I. and Sears, R.R. (1940). Minor Studies of Aggression: VI. Correlation of Lynchings with Economic Indices. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied,* 9. 301-310.

Inglehart, Ronald F. (2008). Changing Values among Western Publics from 1970 to 2006. *West European Politics* 31:1-2. 130-146.

Inglehart, Ronald and Baker, Wayne E. (2000). Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values. *American Sociological Review* 65:1. 19-51.

INSOMAR (2009). *Fenomenul discriminării în România: Percepţii şi atitudini*. [The discrimination phenomenon in Romania: Perceptions and attitudes] Bucharest: The Author.

Institutul pentru Politici Publice (2003). *Intoleranţă, discriminare, extremism. România 2003* . [Intolerance, discrimination, extremism. Romania 2003] Bucharest: The Author. Available from:

http://www.ipp.ro/old/altemateriale/Intoleranta%20Discriminare%20Extremism%20Romania%202003.pdf

Jackson, Anna M. (1974). Tokenism or Total Involvement? *Professional Psychology* 5:4. 429-433.

Jaucourt, Louis de. (1765). Préjugé. [Prejudice] In Diderot, Denis and D'Alembert, Jean (Eds.), *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* [Encyclopaedia or rational dictionary of the sciences, arts, and crafts] (pp. 283-284). Paris: André le Breton et al.. Retrieved from http://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/L%E2%80%99Encyclop%C3%A9die/Volume_13#PR.C3.89JUG.C3.89

Jones, F.L. (1997). Ethnic Diversity and National Identity. *Journal of Sociology* 333. 285-305.

Kitzinger, Celia. (1987) *The Social Construction of Lesbianism.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Kleiner, Brian. (1998) Whatever: Its Use in Pseudo-Argument. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 305. 589-613.

Leyens, Jacques-Philippe, Rodriguez-Perez, Armando, Rodriguez-Torres, Ramon, Gaunt, Ruth, Paladino, Maria-Paola, Vaes, Jeroen and Demoulin, Stéphanie. (2001). Psychological Essentialism and the Differential Attribution of Uniquely Human Emotions to Ingroups and Outgroups. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 31. 395-411.

Marcu, Afrodita M. (2007). *Dehumanization of Ethnic Groups in Britain and Romania: Socio-Cognitive and Ideological Aspects.* PhD Thesis. Guildford, UK: University of Surrey.

McConaghy, J. (1983). Modern Racism, Ambivalence and the Modern Racism Scale. In Dovidio, John and Gaertner, Samuel L. (Eds.), *Prejudice, Discrimination and Racism: Theory and Reserch* (pp. 91-126). New York: Academic Press.

Metcalf, H. (2009). *Paygap across the Equality Strands: A Review.* Manchester: NIESR.

Meyer, Ilan H. (1995) Minority Stress and Mental Health in Gay Men. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 36:1. 38-56.

Milgram, Stanley. (1963). Behavioral Study of Obedience. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67:4. 371-378.

Mogoș, Andreea. (2009). *Réalités sociales médiatisées: représentations sociales des Roumains dans la presse écrite française.* [Mediated social realities: Social representations of Romanians in the French written press]. PhD Thesis. Paris: Université Paris-8 Vincennes-Saint Denis. Retrieved from http://1.static.e-corpus.org/download/notice_file/1098665/MogosThese.pdf

Monroe, Kristen R., Hankin, J. and Van Vechten, R.B. (2000). The Psychological Foundations of Identity Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 3. 419-447.

Monteith, Margo J., Deneen, Nicole E. and Tooman, Gregory D. (1996). The Effect of Social Norm Activation on the Expression of Opinions Concerning Gay Men and Blacks. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 18:3. 267-288.

Moraru, Adriana. (2010). Social Perception of Homosexuality in Romania. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 5. 45-49.

Morrison, Ann M. and von Glinow, Mary. (1990). Women and Minorities in Management. *American Psychologist* 45:2. 200-208.

Morrison, Melanie A. and Morrison, Todd G. (2002). Development and Validation of a Scale Measuring Modern Prejudice toward Gay Men and Lesbian Women. *Journal of Homosexuality* 43:2. 15-37.

Nelson, Todd D. (Ed., 2009). *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination.* New York: Psychology Press.

Oprea, Alexandra. (2005). The Arranged Marriage of Ana Maria Cioabă, Intra-Community

Oppression and Romani Feminist Ideals: Transcending the 'Primitive Culture' Argument. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 12:2. 133-148.

Paluck, Elizabeth L. and Green, Donald P. (2009). Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice. *Annual Review of Psychology* 60. 339-367.

Paolini, Stefania, Harwood, Jake and Rubin, Mark. (2010). Negative Intergroup Contact Makes Group Memberships Salient: Explaining Why Intergroup Conflict Endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36:12. 1723-1738.

Parker, Ian. (2004). *Qualitative Psychology: Introducing Radical Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Pascoe, Elizabeth A. and Richman, Laura S. (2009). Perceived Discrimination and Health: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychological Bulletin* 135:4. 531-554.

Peel, Elizabeth. (2001). Mundane Heterosexism: Understanding Incidents of the Everyday. *Women's Studies International Forum* 24:5. 541-554.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Tropp, Linda R. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90:5. 751-783.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., Tropp, Linda R., Wagner, Ulrich and Christ, Oliver. (2011). Recent Advances in Intergroup Contact Theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35:3. 271-280.

Potter, Jonathan and Wetherell, Margaret. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Rodríguez-Pérez, Armando, Delgado-Rodríguez, Naira, Betancor-Rodríguez, Verónica, Leyens, Jacques-Philippe, and Vaes, Jeroen. (2011). Infra-Humanization of Outgroups Throughout the World. The Role of Similarity, Intergroup Friendship, Knowledge of the Outgroup, and Status. *Anales de Psicología* 273. 679-687.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. (1960). *Critique de la raison dialectique.* [The Critique of Dialectical Reason] Paris: Gallimard.

Saucier, Donald A., Miller, Carol T. and Doucet, Nicole. (2005). Differences in Helping Whites and Blacks: A Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 9:1. 2-16.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. (1994). *Tendencies.* London: Routledge.

Schein, Virginia E. (1973). The Relationship between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57:2. 95-100.

Sherif, Muzafer, Harvey, O.J., White, B.J., Hood, R.H. and Sherif, C.W. (1954). *Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment.* Middletown, CT : Wesleyan University Press.

Sibley, Chris G. and Duckitt, John. (2008). Personality and Prejudice: A Meta-Analysis and Theoretical Review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 12:3. 248-279.

Sidanius, James and Pratto, Felicia. (1999). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Spencer,Steven J., Steele, Claude M. and Quinn, Diane M. (1999). Stereotype Threat and Women's Math Performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 35:1. 4-28.

Spineanu-Dobrotă, Sorin. (2005). *Homosexualitatea între normal şi patologic.* [Homosexuality between normality and pathology] Bucharest: Tritonic.

Stainton-Rogers, Wendy. (2003). *Social Psychology: Experimental and Critical Approaches.* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Staub, Ervin. (1989). *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steele, Claude M. and Aronson, Joshua. (1995). Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69:5.

797-811.

Stephan, Walter G. and Stephan, Cookie W. (1985). Intergroup Anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues* 41:3. 157-175.

Stephan, Walter G. and Stephan, Cookie W. (2000). An Integrated Threat Theory of Prejudice. In Oskamp, Stuart (Ed.), *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination* (pp. 23-45). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stoler, Ann L. (1995). *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Swim, Janet K. (1994). Perceived versus Meta-Analytic Effect Sizes: An Assessment of The Accuracy of Gender Stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 66:1. 21-36.

Swim, Janet K. and Stangor, Charles. (1998). *Prejudice: The Target's Perspective.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Tajfel, Henri. (1970). Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination. *Scientific American* 223. 96-102.

Tajfel, Henri and Turner, John C. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of Inter-Group Behavior. In Worchel, S. and Austin, W.G. (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tileagă, Cristian. (2005). Accounting for Extreme Prejudice and Legitimating Blame in Talk about the Romanies. *Discourse and Society* 16:5. 603-624.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1992). Discourse and the Denial of Racism. *Discourse and Society* 3:1. 87-118.

Wetherell, Margaret. (1998). Positioning and Interpretive Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-Structuralism in Dialogue. *Discourse and Society* 9. 387-412.

Wetherell, Margaret and Potter, Jonathan. (1992). *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Williams, Christine L. (1992). The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the 'Female' Professions. *Social Problems* 39:3. 253-267.

Williams, David R., Neighbors, Harold W. and Jackson, James S. (2003). Racial/Ethnic Discrimination and Health: Findings from Community Studies. *American Journal of Public Health* 93:2. 200-208.

Woodcock, S. (2009). Gay Pride as Violent Containment in Romania: A Brave New Europe. *Sextures* 1:1. 7-23.

World Health Organization. (2009). *Women and Health: Today's Evidence Tomorrow's Agenda.* Geneva: The Author.

World Health Organization. (2001). *Health and Freedom from Discrimination.* Geneva: The Author.

---

[1] Goffman's (1963) work on *stigma* -- 'the situation of the individual who is disqualified from complete social acceptance' (p.9) -- is a notable exception to this trend.